

No. 7

A Rebellious People.

A God of Judgment.

The End Thereof?

Who will have the last word?

The Judge!



This people hath a rebellious and revolting heart.

—Jer. 5:23

For these things God will bring thee to Judgment.

—Eccl. 11:9

What will ye do in the end thereof?—Jer. 5:31

LETTER NO. 34.

The Grecian or Professorial Backslider?

MY DEAR SIR:—

You express surprise that I “should feel astonished at the length to which the professorial caste are drifting from God, His Bible and the Truth, and seeking to drag with them their pupils, and, through them, their parents,” and you ask me “what else could be expected: the most cultured of cultured people, in the days of the Apostle Paul, turning their backs upon God, in hopeless and helpless misery erected in Athens, their metropolis, an altar ‘to the unknown God’—can you expect any better results from the uninspired backsliders of to-day?”

I thank you for your reminder. You are right—it was ever thus. God who changeth not is ever presenting Himself as the true object of the love and service of His creatures. What a return has been largely made!

God or the Devil? The Devil is chosen, with loss of Eden. God or Baal? Baal is chosen, with captivity.

God or Barabbas? Barabbas is chosen and Israel becomes wanderers.

God or “the Darwinian resultant?” We choose the Darwinian resultant, with the nauseous “olla podrida” that flows from it being a seething mass of sin, concocted by the children of the Devil, Baal and Barabbas!

God help and save us from the degradation of attempting to follow the ever-changing “unknown God” offered to a hungry world by the colleges of to-day.

LETTER NO. 35.

Higher Criticism or Reverent Investigation?

You say, "What is your objection to the 'higher criticism or the higher critics' and their work—you surely are not opposed to reverent Biblical investigation or enquiry?"

I object to "criticism," whether high or low, of God or His Word. Our God gave us the first Commandment, with promise, "Honour thy father and thy mother." The child is to honour, and not to criticize, his father. If this is the position that the child is to take towards his earthly parent, how much more is it the case in our approach to "our Father who art in Heaven"—Him whom we should serve with reverence and godly fear. We should surely ever bear in mind the words of warning God gave to His servant Job—now so largely forgotten—"Shall he that contendeth with the Almighty instruct Him?" or "Shall he that cavilleth contend with the Almighty?" "He that reproveth God, let him answer it."

For how much shall these vain men have to answer to God! God has given the method of approach whereby His teaching will be imparted—a humble and lowly spirit asking for the Divine guidance, so that He that inspired the Word may make plain the language which the searcher seeks to comprehend.

To such God ever gives ear and enlightens, but while

"Blind unbelief is sure to err and scan His Word
in vain,"

to the humble and lowly Christian believer it is ever made true that

“God is His own Interpreter and He will make it plain.”

In this research the seeker generally gets what he looks for. If he seeks light, help, guidance, explanation, he gets it. If he reads to cavil, to discover supposed discrepancies and mistakes, to procure new-fangled notions, he will go away empty of good and stuffed with what he sought.

So far from depreciating “Biblical enquiry and investigation,” I counsel continuous research, aided by the investigations of such reverent and spiritual commentators as will be felt to be useful and helpful as you read and ponder. Do not waste time with those more desirous of showing off themselves and their supposed knowledge and wisdom, rather than showing you how God’s Spirit opens up His Word. These men seek to make people believe that all Biblical research began with them, and that unless you follow their unscientific and unhistorical methods you are a mere child that cannot comprehend the Bible. But this is not the case. Readers of the Bible have ever used, when they could procure them, such helps as “Burder’s Oriental Customs” and “Burder’s Oriental Literature.” These were issued in the beginning of last century as true helps to the study of God’s Word. They, with many other more recent works of the same class, edified and built up, without impugning any portion of the Word. Thereafter come in “the new-fanglers,” seeking to show off their shallow learning, to make “the Word of God of none effect,” and finally to urge Christian people to reject the Bible and to accept in its place a book from which is eliminated all that

makes it a Godlike production—a man-made professor's Bible.

Thank you for your quotations. I like them. "Is not my Word like a fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?"—Jer. 23: 29.

"O Word of God incarnate,
O wisdom from on high,
O truth unchanged, unchanging,
O Light of our dark sky:
We praise Thee for the radiance
That from the hallowed page,
A lantern to our footsteps,
Shines on from age to age."

God makes no mistakes in Nature or Revelation.

LETTER NO. 36.

Some Results of Professorial Colleges.

In writing, you say to me, "What a comment on the teaching of our professors is found in the awful atrocities committed on the farm in the neighbourhood of North Bay?" Yes, by this time these terrible crimes are known throughout the whole of the civilized world. Crimes which might well have caused the inhabitants of Sodom to discuss at their street corners whether they must not precede the downfall of the city, and the people of Chicago to call an indignation meeting and open a crusade for the casting out of the teachers of irreligion from their colleges, and open a crusade for a moral reform. This will never be done from the inside; it must be done by the people rising up in their strength and demanding purer teaching and purer morals. The bare recital of the matter fills one with humiliation and

grief. A married man commits incest with three of his daughters, the youngest of whom is not fifteen years of age. Three children, known to the family, are born of these acts. With a like knowledge three of these children are murdered. One may call out with the Prophet Jeremiah, "A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land." But what did this unfortunate husband and children do, and what did this blighted family sanction, beyond what some professors—leaders in colleges—present to the pupils as being matters, not only to be tolerated, but welcomed! The evil of incest a mere question of opinion! Infanticide to be commended, as children are a nuisance to father and mother! It may be well that we should have had this illustration in order that people may see what a hell upon earth a country will be turned into when the suggestions of our professors—devils clothed in the guise of angels of light—are fully known, and regulate the citizens of the land.

A full account of these atrocities should be sent to each professor in each college, in order that they may comprehend what ready disciples they have, willing to follow out literally their teaching. It will never do to hand this matter over to the priestly caste. Long before the time that they crucified our Lord they were false to God, and to His Word, and ever sought to persuade the people to follow the gods of their creation. The words of Moses—the man of God—should to-day ring in the ears of every person who has the welfare of our land at heart. This should be marked as the principal matter of our lives, and no rest should be taken or given until there be a complete cleansing of the institutions that, if continued, will cause death to the best interests

of our country. Look at the 30th chapter of Deuteronomy, and read with me as follows:—

“See, I have set before thee this day life and
“good, and death and evil;

“In that I command thee this day *to love the*
“*Lord thy God, to walk in His ways, and to keep*
“*His commandments and His statutes and His*
“*judgments*, that thou mayest live and multiply:
“and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land
“whither thou goest to possess it.

“But if thine heart turn away, so that thou wilt
“not hear, but shalt be drawn away, and worship
“other gods, and serve them;

“I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely
“perish, and that ye shall not prolong your days
“upon the land. I call heaven and earth to record
“this day against you, that I have set before you
“life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore
“choose life, that both thou and thy seed may
“live:

“That thou mayest love the Lord thy God, and
“that thou mayest obey His voice, and that thou
“mayest cleave unto Him: for He is thy life and
“the length of thy days.”

Nearly fifteen hundred years before the coming of Christ there was set before the people by his servant the alternative: love, and reverence to God and His Word, and the walking in His ways, to be followed by the blessing of God; turning away from Him, and not hearing Him, and worshipping other gods, the curse of God and the shortening of their days.

The battle to-day, is between God and His Word and

walking in His ways, or another God and another Word and forsaking the ways of the Lord.

There is again set before the people this day the choice—life and good; death and evil. We cannot get away from this position—it is upon us.

At another period in the history of God's people, eight hundred years after the time of Moses, occurred a state of matters which so resembles the present crisis that I cannot help quoting from the 23rd chapter of Jeremiah at large. It was one of the recurrent movements which well and forcibly illustrates what is going on to-day. God's warnings. Man's disregard thereof. Man's falling away. God's punishment:—

“Mine heart within me is broken because of the
“prophets; all my bones shake.

“I have seen folly in the prophets; they prophesied and caused my people Israel to err.

“I have seen also in the prophets a horrible thing;
“they walk in lies; they strengthen also the hands
“of evil-doers, that none doth return from his wickedness; they are all of them unto me as Sodom,
“and the inhabitants thereof as Gomorrah.

“From the prophets is profaneness gone forth
“into all the land.

“They speak a vision of their own heart, and not
“out of the mouth of the Lord.

“I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran:
“I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied.

“How long shall this be in the heart of the
“prophets, that prophesy lies? Yea, they are
“prophets of the deceit of their own heart;

“Which think to cause my people to forget my,

“name by their dreams which they tell every man
“to his neighbour.

“Therefore, behold, I am against the prophets,
“saith the Lord.

“Behold, I am against them that prophesy false
“dreams, saith the Lord, and who tell them, and
“cause my people to err by their lies and by their
“lightness; yet I sent them not nor commanded
“them: therefore they shall not profit this people
“at all, saith the Lord.”

It is no wonder that the professors, as did the priestly caste of old, dethrone God and reject His Word. Such condemnation of them, their teaching and their misleading of the people, is found in the Scriptures, that they hate both the one and the other. We find in both what is to-day called popery. There is the arrogant, self-sufficient, worship-demanding spirit in the college class rooms almost as largely as at Rome—the difference being that while the former has not the force to compel obedience, the latter possesses it—although, thank God, to an ever diminishing extent.

By what subtle hypnotic power has the professor lulled to sleep the ruling authorities to whom he is responsible? Will he, strengthened by his past immunity, proceed further and seek to procure such legislation as will stereotype his conclusions into the law of the land? or shall we be first in the field, and seek to have it declared that, whatever may be the conscientious conviction of the individual, which must be respected, although deplored, when he proceeds so far as to proclaim in the colleges of the land that God is to be dethroned and His Word rejected, and a man-made God and a man-made Bible to replace them, then that he is guilty of blasphemy

and treason and brings himself within the criminal law of the land?

The good, sound common sense of the legislatures of the land will lead them to come to the rescue of the people against the aggressions of the colleges. If our people knew how general is this teaching, and the length to which it has gone, and will continue to go, as shown in Pamphlet No. 6, they would with no uncertain sound condemn it, and insist that the colleges, sustained by them, should cast out the men who there dishonour God and His Word.

LETTER NO. 37.

I Say Unto All, Watch!

You ask me "what position the Church of England takes on the question of the inspiration of the Bible, and whether its Theological Colleges stand true to the Word of God or not?" You are no doubt aware that on the ordination of a Clergyman of the Church of England an answer to the following question is required by the Bishop: "Do you unfeignedly believe all the canonical scriptures of the Old and New Testament?" and that, according to the prescribed form in the ordination service, the applicant as a condition of ordination is obliged to reply: "I do believe them." You observe, the question embraces the words "unfeignedly" and "all." There is no room for mental reservation or equivocation. There is no exclusion. It is not the acceptance of some of the books with the omission of even one, or of even some or one of the chapters, of any one book. He pledges his oath that he "unfeignedly" believes "all," and it is perjury for a man to say "I

do believe them," unless there be the "unfeigned" assent to "all." Moreover, this is the condition presented by the Church on which entrance to the ministry is obtained. Any man of honour is bound to observe the condition on which he obtains a benefit for which he asks. If he does not do so, he is a dishonest man and stands before his congregation from week to week convicted of unrighteousness, while he presumes to reason with them of "righteousness, temperance and judgment to come."

Then it is further to be borne in mind that in like manner the Church has sought to safeguard her Theological Colleges from the entrance therein of men of unsound mind. A college is *prima facie* entitled to accept one who has taken this solemn oath, as a man of his word, who will not by perjury break faith with the Church which has given him his title, on the faith of which he stands in her pulpits as an accepted messenger, and enters her college halls to preserve the faith to which he has pledged his adherence. It is to be observed that the Church of England has never, as in some of the Presbyterian Colleges, watered down the solemn covenant to be entered into when the student applies for entrance to the Church, by accepting the qualifying words, "I believe substantially" in the Bible. Such a qualification leaves the whole matter at large. It is for the student to determine what is "substantial" to his mind. Of course, under thns he can make his selections from the Pentateuch; can play fast and loose with the Book of Jonah, and reduce to a minimum what he is pleased to consider the "substantial" portions of the Scriptures.

It is painful to see a Church playing with the Word

of God rather than reject a "clever" student, who may join the Unitarians if the supposed orthodox Church refuses him!

But, although the old time-honoured standard of the Church is still preserved, yet it cannot be denied but that some dishonestly slip through, and, without due care, or because the Examiner or Bishop is in harmony with the new professorial Bible and the new thought, unsound men are found as her ministers and teachers in some of her Theological Colleges.

I have recently been informed that it would be well to look at home in the matter of unsound teaching in Anglican pulpits and Theological Colleges of the Dominion. Certain names were given, and statements said to have been made by some of her ministers and professors were repeated, which showed a sad forgetfulness of ordination vows. Some of the students were outspoken.

I entirely agree with you that, as this matter has now been taken up, it should be thoroughly investigated. If the men who, it is alleged, are thus speaking and teaching, desire to prove these accusations to be untrue, it is easy for them to do so, with satisfaction to themselves and others, by displaying their lectures and sermons and giving a list of the text-books which are in use by them.

LETTER NO. 38.

Blind Watchmen?

You "think that" a whole system of supervision is defective, and that if there was anything like the care exercised that is employed by a business man in his ordinary affairs, such a state of matters as is now found

in our churches and colleges could never have arisen." You suggest that "it looks as if there was a general conspiracy among the whole priestly caste to create the idea that the Bible is not a book that can be comprehended by the laity; that its comprehension depends on a knowledge possessed by learned sacerdotalists and scientists alone; that it is the duty of the congregations to receive the Bible as made by their priests and ministers, and thankfully, without question, adopt their findings; that if matters are allowed to proceed there will be called a Twentieth Century Council of Trent, composed of the priestly element, at which a book modelled on its misconceptions will be brought forth, and the hymns will be thereby manacled. As the priestly caste can, they say, alone comprehend, they alone can lay down the rules to be drawn from the Bible, and the people must accept. What is to be done?"

There are some splendid exceptions; but too many are adopting your views. It is said to be the duty of the people to hear the Church, as represented in each locality by her parish priest, and to accept unquestioned at his hand the teaching he may give—but how diverse will this instruction be? The rule you are to follow will depend to a large extent on the street in which you live. And with all your care, when you come back to the last analysis, no priest or minister can answer for you at the supreme moment—the judgment seat of God. The Judge will then apply to you personally His Word and condemn or exculpate according to its language—not the priest's or the critic's gloss. The prophets and the priests may prophecy and teach "lies," but you have the inspired Word of God, which, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, will lead you into all truth, and that is the

God-given, true and only standard, which will be applied when its Author calls you to your account and "the books are opened."

You must "try the spirits." A great many men to-day in the ministry are very nice, pleasant-spoken men. They have a method of ingratiating themselves with the members of their congregations, so that they say, "You know, I do not like to disoblige our minister. I often feel uncomfortable at what he says, but I do not like to refuse him in what he asks, and so I continue to attend his ministry." Take care! He may be a very nice man—but be careful; he may be a Naaman "was also a mighty man of valour; but—he was a leper." Take care!

How often in the history of God's people has He had to complain of "blind watchmen"! How often has the lament been repeated, as to the want of care of Israel! Over 2,500 years ago He mourns over this neglect.

"His watchmen are blind: they are all ignorant, they are all dumb dogs, they cannot bark; sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber," Isa. 56: 10. And He seeks to stir up the people with these burning words: "Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem, and see now, and know, and seek in the broad places thereof, if ye can find a man, if there be any that executeth judgment, that seeketh the truth; and I will pardon her," Jer. 5: 1.

What is the answer of the people of our city to this demand of God repeated in our midst? The curse of to-day is that our people have lost true vision and proportion. The head is so bent down tithing their garden stuff, "mint and anise and cummin," that the "weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith," are

not seen; they are neglected; they are left undone. In the grasp of the material our people are being strangled. The god of this world hath blinded them. O God, wilt Thou not in Thy mercy find for us "a man"—the "man," whether he be Primate, Archbishop, Superintendent, priest, minister, or any "man," so long as he be the man of Thy choice—the "vox clamantis" in the wilderness of this dark and seething world, the inhabitants whereof to-day know not where to turn. "Men's hearts failing them for fear" (Luke 21: 26); "Wars and rumours of wars"; "nation rising against nation, and kingdom against kingdom. Earthquakes in divers places, famines and troubles—the beginnings of sorrows" (Mark 13: 7, 8). How blind and deaf must be the man that does not hear the near approach of an upheaval, such as the world has not known for centuries. "O ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?" Matt 16: 3.

What a cowardly spectacle is now presented to the world? The people of a great nation going hysterically up and down her length and breadth with chattering teeth calling out, "Dreadnought." It cajoles her colonies, under the specious statement of giving them an option, to join her in the expenditure of hundreds of millions charged on a long-suffering community, already burdened with taxes, rates and charges too heavy for them to bear. This is done in order that the rulers may be able to incite one another to the royal game of kings, so called because they lock themselves up safely in their palaces while they send their loved subjects to be murdered to the so-called patriotic music of brass bands. "But He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision." The Dreadnoughts,

which usually go into the Imperial junk shop as they are finished, to be replaced by larger ones, are barely under way before the teeth-chattering and hysterics commence afresh with renewed vigour. But this time the terror is "airships," as they find that the Royal game is removed to the air and an Imperial dragon hovering over London, Paris, Berlin or St. Petersburg, can let fall a few drops of powder, which in a moment can lay desolate any metropolis in the world!

How hideous must all this be in the sight of the Prince of Peace, who nigh 2,000 years ago came to bring "peace on earth—good will towards men," and who gave the injunction, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." He leaves no doubt as to the answer to the question, what is the parentage of the war-makers? What a joy it will be to the anarchists, under the tuition of kings, to join in the game of wrecking the world by blowing up peaceful cities for the fun of seeing them crumble to pieces and kings fleeing from their royal abodes! Verily this Royal game is driving us to the verge of a terrible volcano, let blind optimists say what they please!

Find this man, O Lord; awaken him out of his slumber; put words in his mouth; touch with a coal of fire his lips; give him Thy word of power, so that, Joshua-like, he may lead us. Encourage again the "man" chosen, saying to him, "I will be with thee; I will not fail thee nor forsake thee. Be strong and of a good courage" (Joshua 1: 5, 6). May Thy angel "stand over against him with his sword drawn in his hand," and may he say, "as captain of the host of the Lord am I now come," Joshua 5: 13, 14. Let us with one voice cry unto Thee, and wilt Thou prove to us by our deliv-

erance that the Lord's hand is not shortened that it cannot save; neither His ear heavy that it cannot hear," Isa. 59: 1. "Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the Lord; awake as in the ancient days in the generations of old," Isa. 59: 9. "Though the vision tarry, wait for it, it will come," Hab. 2: 3.

LETTER NO. 39.

Reference has been made to four matters: (a) "Suggestions," issued by the Bishop of Nova Scotia at the ordinations which take place in his Diocese; (b) the proposal for the enrichment (?) of the Prayer Book; (c) the late pageant of the Church of England acted at Lambeth Palace; (d) the proposed new Book of Common Praise. It is said, that while these matters peculiarly belong to the Anglican Communion, yet, at this period, when union is so much spoken of, it is of interest to know what is being done or proposed, in each, in respect of those questions which have to do with the vital points in church matters.

This may be so, but at all events they present action on the part of the priestly caste, showing the trend of its teaching and what the Churches, with which union is suggested, must expect to find if it is consummated.

The fairest way to deal with these "Suggestions respectfully offered for more reverent celebration of the Holy Eucharist" is to look at them as a whole, and I have therefore had them reprinted, and they will be found as part of this letter, at page 18

It appears to me that the language of the Reverend Jeremy Taylor may well be applied to those propounding or following these suggestions: "They dishonour and make a pageantry of the Sacrament."

It is very remarkable, when people fail to grasp the higher or spiritual side of religion or a service, how they become lost in a little petty round of observances, and thereby are so bent on the material that they fail to lift up the eyes to the true central point of the service—to Jesus Christ, our Great High Priest and Sacrifice, our Advocate and Intercessor, sitting on the right hand of God. They are so insistent on walking by sight and not by faith, and the priest is so determined to claim reverence for making God out of a piece of bread, that he seeks to surround himself and the ceremony with tawdry, spectacular arrangements, to the dishonour of God and His service. It creates irreverence of God and a passing reverence of the priest and his pageant, which are looked upon and taken to be the essence of the service, and the mind does not go beyond it. Indeed, on the false notion of the Sacredotalist why should it? The "body of Christ" is, through the manipulation of the priest, present in the Church. Why go seek for Him in Heaven?

Now let us see what is sought to be introduced by these suggestions, which are illegal, and to which any member of the Church is entitled to object and to have prohibited.

There is one word which, because of all that was built upon it in the Church of Rome, and especially in the communion office of its mass book, the compilers purged out of the reformed Book of Common Prayer. This was done thoroughly, so that in the communion office of the Church of England Book of Common Prayer the word "*altar*" is not found; but the word "*table*" has been substituted therefor, in order, if possible, to blot out the fundamental error of the Church of Rome with the mass of false teaching which surrounds it.

The priests, finding that they are impeded in their Romeward progress, have formed an organized campaign to compel the use of this term, so as to introduce the fundamental error, that our Church has a sacrificing priest. He finds he is greatly handicapped in this without his altar.

In the Communion Service of the Church of England the word "altar" does not appear, and is replaced 13 times by the word "table."

(1) In these "Suggestions" the word "altar" appears 12 times replacing the word "table."

(2) Water is mixed with the wine. Declared illegal.

(3) The "body of Christ" is to be placed "in the hand." Rank popery, as our Prayer Book declares the body of Christ is in Heaven. No transubstantiation.

(4) There is no "oblation of the bread and wine." There is but the one offering of Christ—once for all.

(5) On the altar should be placed "the two lights." Illegal.

(6) The priest to stand before the middle of the altar, so that his nominal acts cannot be seen. Illegal.

The suggestions are full of minute, childish regulations, interfering with the service as it ought to be conducted, but a part of the general scheme in England and Canada of the Sacredotalists to Romanize our Church. This should be taken up in every Parish and made a vital question. In the meantime, it is well that our laymen should know their rights and, as true sons of the Church, insist upon them. I therefore venture to give the following quotation from the judgment of the late Sir Alexander Cockburn, when Chief Justice of England, in the celebrated Clewer case:—

SUGGESTIONS

Respectfully Offered for the More Reverent Celebration of the Holy Eucharist

1st. Let the celebrant or an assistant in holy orders make all the necessary preparations.

2nd. If the bread be not prepared for the special purpose, let such be used as may be least likely to crumble. Let it be cut, nearly through, in portions never more than one-fourth of an inch square. The wine should be the purest which it is possible to obtain. The bread should be placed on a paten, or other convenient receptacle, and the wine and water in their respective flagons or cruets.

3rd. Let all the vessels, linen, ornaments, vestments, etc., be used for this one purpose alone, and never for any other.

4th. The celebrant (having previously made his own spiritual preparation) should be ready in the Vestry some time before the service, to prepare the following, necessary for a reverent celebration, viz., paten, chalice, corporal, pall, chalice veil and purificator.

5th. The celebrant, having put on a surplice, will go to the altar and see that it is properly

vested, and that the fair linen cloth is upon it, covering the top and not the front.

6th. Then place upon the credence the bread, wine and water, as already prepared.

7th. Returning to the vestry, he will vest himself (it is desirable to have vestments reserved for this service only) and thus arrange the holy vessels.* Upon the chalice place a purificator and then the paten. upon the paten place the pall, covering the whole with the chalice veil, and placing upon it the burse containing the corporal only, the opening of the burse being turned toward him.

8th. After reciting a prayer (the "Veni Creator" is recommended), let him proceed to the altar, carrying the chalice, etc., as arranged, in his left hand, the right being placed upon the burse.

9th. Placing the chalice a little on one side, let him, from the burse, take the corporal (leaning the burse against the retable), and spread it upon the middle of the altar, placing on the centre of the corporal the still veiled chalice.

10th. After a few moments of self-recollection and intention, let him proceed with the

*It would be well to have a special table to place these upon, or at least to spread a napkin for the purpose.

service, standing on the north side of the altar until the Creed; then, until the end of the service, standing before the middle of the altar.

11th. Immediately after the alms have been placed upon the altar, the celebrant will unveil the chalice, placing the veil, pall and purificator on the Epistle side. He will then bring from the credence the bread, and place upon the paten no more than is thought sufficient, and in like manner the wine (adding a little water), taking back to the credence what has not been offered. It is better to consecrate the second time than to have much remaining.

[NOTE.—The alms should not be on the altar at the time of consecration, but should immediately after being presented be removed to the credence.]

12th. Let him replace the chalice upon the middle of the corporal (covering the chalice with the pall), and the paten in front of the chalice (covering the paten with the right-hand corner of the corporal).

13th. In the Prayer of Consecration, the celebrant will uncover the paten at the words "Who in the same night," covering it again after the words "Do this"; uncovering the chalice at the words "likewise," etc., and covering it again after the Prayer of Consecration.

14th. The celebrant should receive standing.

15th. It is more reverent and rubrical to place the "Body of Christ," not in the fingers

of the communicant, but in the hand, which should in no case be gloved.

16th. After the blessing, let the celebrant himself reverently consume whatever remains of the consecrated bread and wine. This can easily be done if he has been careful in estimating the number of communicants.

17th. Then let him wipe the paten with the purificator, likewise the chalice, first consuming from it a little wine, then a little wine and water, then a little water only.

18th. Then let him arrange the chalice, etc., as before the celebration, and, after a few moments of thanksgiving, carry them to the vestry, where, after prayer, let him put them, thoroughly cleansed, in their respective places.

19th. Then let him, vested in surplice, bring from the credence the unconsecrated bread and wine, with the flagons, etc. The altar book should be replaced upon the credence.

20th. Let the sacred vessels be kept under lock and key, and be at all times scrupulously clean, polished and bright.

The above suggestions are applicable where there is no server. If there be one, he will perform several of the duties assigned to the celebrant.

They relate also to the case in which neither Matins nor Litany immediately precede the Divine Service. If either should precede, the chalice, etc., may be first placed on the credence and (as in the above suggestions) placed

upon the altar, just before the Communion Service is begun, or after the offertory sentences.

The chalice, etc., should not be on the altar during either Matins or Litany.

Several other and more minute directions might be given, but it is thought that these will aid those who are truly anxious to perform, with reverence, the highest act of Christian worship.

If there be another clergyman present he should act as server, bringing to the celebrant the bread and wine (and water) for the oblation, and also, after service, the wine and water for the ablutions. If he take part in the service, it should not be more than the Epistle, the longer exhortation, the confession and the administration of the cup.

Even if many clergymen be present, not more than two should assist the celebrant, of whom one should read the Gospel, the other the Epistle, the longer exhortation and the confession. But a convenient number may assist in communicating the people.

It is desirable that the people should stand up when the celebrant enters the chancel, and that they should remain upon their knees until after the consumption, and not leave their places until the celebrant has entered the vestry.

The purificator should only be used once, then put into a bowl of water kept in the

vestry for that purpose, left there for some time, then carefully rinsed and hung in the vestry to dry, after which it may be sent to be washed. The water in which the purificators are placed should be frequently changed, and poured down the font or on the ground.

APPENDIX.

The Altar.

An altar should be at least three feet six inches high and two feet six inches broad. Its length will depend upon the size of the church; five feet is the least it should ever be. In a church of any size it should be seven or nine feet.

The retable will be the length of the altar, and about eight inches high and six broad. On it should be placed the cross, vases of flowers, and the two lights.

If possible, let there be a credence table; a shelf used for the purpose is better than nothing, but it is only a make-shift.

Communion for the Sick.

If possible, use the veil and burse and the linen, as described before.

Too much care cannot be given at either private or public celebrations to the scrupulously thorough cleansing of the paten and chalice. The ablutions will be taken as at a public celebration.

Holy Baptism.

The rubric directs that the font is "then (*i.e.*, when the priest comes to it) to be filled with pure water." Blunt says:—"Some decorous vessel should be provided for bringing the water to the font, so as to avoid the use of an ordinary domestic pail or can." Of course, the water will be placed in the font, and not in a bowl put in the font. The priest will never allow the font to be decorated in a way that would in the least interfere with its due use at any moment.

A violet stole is worn until the sponsors have, in the name of the child, "renounced the devil and all his works, etc. It is then changed for a white one.

The water should be poured, not sprinkled, on the child. For this purpose a shell is convenient, though not necessary. It is an ancient and laudable custom to pour the water three times.

If a server be employed he will bring to the font stoles, book, shell and napkin, and hand them to the officiant as required.

When a private baptism is necessary, let it be with as little ceremonial or ritual as possible. It is supposed to be in a case of great emergency, when nothing but the absolute essentials are ministered. It is to be remembered that sponsors are to be admitted and the sign of the cross used, not at the actual baptism,

but upon the public reception of the baptized child, if it should live.

The foregoing does not, of course, apply to the case where, in a scattered country parish, a clergyman uses a house as a church, and gathers a congregation there for a baptism; then he will act as in a church.

Note on the Office of a Deacon.

A deacon should not take any part of the Communion Service, except when assisting a priest, and then he should only say the Gospel or Epistle, the confession and the words appointed for him "that delivereth the cup." Consequently, if a deacon be ministering without a priest, he should not use what is commonly (though most incorrectly) termed the ante-Communion Service; he should never offer the alms on the altar; if there be no priest present he should place them on the credence. He should not say any prayer standing at the altar at any time, but close the service from the pulpit or reading-desk. He should baptize only in the absence of a priest.

If, when the service of a priest cannot be obtained, a deacon officiates at a marriage ceremony, he should be careful to use none of the benedictions. He is present only in the capacity of a witness; but there can be no objection to his joining with the people in offering the prayers of the Church for the occasion.

"It is the undoubted right of every inhabitant of every Parish in the kingdom, desirous of frequenting the Parish church, to have the services of the Church performed according to the ritual of the Church, as established by law, without having his religious sense shocked and outraged by the introduction of innovations not sanctioned by law or usage, and which may appear to him to be inconsistent with the simplicity of the Protestant worship and to pertain to a religion which he believes to be erroneous, and the ritual of which is not that of the Church of England."

"In these questions of doctrine or ritual the laity are interested, and deeply interested, as well as the clergy."

"It is the right of the laity, being members of the Church, to take part, under the ministration of the clergy, in the public worship, as well as to have the benefit of the various rites and services of the Church according to the ritual of the Church as by law ascertained and established. One of their most sacred and valued rights is infringed when they are driven to abandon their churches by the introduction of a ritual which is not that of the Church, and which appears to them to be an advance towards a religion which is not that of the Reformation."

It is very shocking that any one to-day in our Protestant Church of England should kneel down and worship a piece of bread, over which a minister has said some words, and the other half of which has formed the breakfast of one of the families of the church. Why should we send out to the heathen missionaries to prevent them worshipping stocks and stones?

The ridicule of the prophet Isaiah was turned upon the man that, having made a god out of a piece of

wood, used the balance to cook his food. What difference between the portion of wood and the piece of bread? It is as rank idolatry in the one case as the other.

John Wycliffe answered the priest who blasphemously declares that by the repeating of certain words the bread becomes "the body of Christ." How canst, O priest, who are but a man, make thy Maker?"

By these Suggestions it is declared that what is given by the priest into the hand of the recipient is the "body of Christ." Hold indignation meetings and cast these false priests out of your Parishes. Are there no faithful clergy and laity to take this matter up and deal with it as true members of our reformed Church?

(2) You ask "I think of the movement for 'Enriching our Prayer Book.'" The above as to No. 1 will not unfairly show you the class of enrichment! If these men can only get in the word "altar," the priestly power of making God, the Confessional, and some further pages from the Roman Missal, they will rejoice, regardless of what sorrow they may cause true churchmen. No, let no profane hands be laid on our Prayer Book, our heritage and that of our children. It cost much blood, let it not pass from us without another life and death struggle. Mix no twentieth century sour milk with the rich cream of a book produced by the blood of martyrs.

(3) Now we come to "the Lambeth pageant." What do I think of it?" You must know my answer. This age of unrest hungers for theatrical displays. "Once in a while one meets with a single soul greater than all the living pageant which passes before it." The Archbishop of Canterbury had this opportunity, but he was

not the "single soul." It was beneath the dignity of the greatest nation in the world to turn the kingdom into "a rare show" and burlesque great events. Theatrical managers may be knighted, but they should not rule. But if Vanity Fair insisted on these displays, it afforded the Church a great opportunity of refusing to be a party to them; to take a dignified position, whereby sacred things should not be dragged triumphantly at the chariot wheels of the theatre. It was a mistake, all the more pronounced as the principal event in our Church, her crowning glory, was entirely ignored. The turning point which led up to England's greatness—the Reformation—found no place amidst the ostentatious displays of merely passing ecclesiastical events.

(4) And now we come to the book inaptly called "The Book of Common Praise." It will not be the fault of the compilers if it does not become the "Book of Uncommon Discord."

At an early period in the work of compilation it was evident that the Sacredotalist element was determined, notwithstanding all remonstrance, to endeavour to thrust upon the Anglican Church in the Dominion a hymn book framed in order to enforce Romish error. These men were implored to refrain from doing that which brute force might enable them to accomplish, but which, in the interest of a united Church and from consideration for their brethren, they should not even desire to carry out. It soon became evident that no consideration for their fellow churchmen would move them. They were determined that such hymns as would aid them in their Romeward movement—the most extreme that could be found—should find their place in the book. It was to be made the most extreme Romish hymn book

ever passed upon by any Synod. The cool answer to the remonstrance was, "You need not use these hymns if you do not like them!" The reply was made to this, "But the hymns are in the hymn book; if not sung, they are there to be read; they are the means of educating our people in the false doctrine taught by the Church of Rome, just as they succeeded in doing at Rome, and in buying and using them in our churches we are guilty of disseminating "false doctrine," when we ask God to deliver us "from all false doctrine. Their battalions were the strongest and they carried their point. They were warned that the book could not be to honest Protestants a hymn book to be used. They sought to force, they sought to cajole, they worked for the imprimatur of the Synod, but after days of electioneering they could only procure its assent to the following report:—

Report.

"That this Joint General Hymnal Committee, to the members of which the Compilation Committee have submitted, from time to time, the various drafts of the Hymnal, do commend the final draft thereof to the General Synod, and report in favor of *permitting the use thereof in the public services of the Church, it being understood that nothing in the Hymnal contained shall be construed as an authoritative pronouncement upon any doctrinal question, or interpreted as impugning or varying any of the Articles or standards of the Church, as set forth in the solemn declaration prefixed to the Constitution of this Synod; and that, with the permission of the Synod, a copy of this resolution be printed in or after the Preface to the Hymnal,*" which was concurred in by both Houses.

This is a strange conclusion. An unkind damning of the publication, not with faint, but without any, praise! It leaves it to each congregation to judge of the hymns and their effect! The Synod refuses to make any "authoritative pronouncement!" It does not like the hymns or the book, but it cannot offend. The shepherds leave it to the sheep to walk or not in these pastures! Now this is a serious position. The burden is cast upon each congregation to determine whether the Protestant Church of England is to adopt hymns taken from the Roman Missal in order to educate into the belief in the wafer-god or not, in which the subtle Romish Jesuit succeeded, and in which the equally subtle Anglican jesuit hopes to succeed. With this heavy responsibility thus cast upon each member of our Church, let us consider "the cause for praise" which the Romanists have given us, and first let me state briefly the manner in which the objections from beginning to end were presented and were never abandoned up to to-day.

(1) This book contains hymns unknown until recently in our Church, and which it is contended, and honestly thought, introduce teaching opposed to that of our standards—the Prayer Book and our Articles—and which being introduced, must be published and spread abroad by those opposed conscientiously thereto. Whether sung or not in particular churches, if the book be what it is put forth as—a Book of Common Praise—if this be not done, the book does not answer the purpose intended

(2) The hymns principally objected to were introduced originally for a specific purpose, and answered so well this purpose that the dogma of transubstantiation was the result. The same hymns, the same purpose—to assimilate to Rome—must give the same result.

(3) The word "altar," cast out of our Prayer Book because of its tendency, is found 12 times in the book—Hymns Nos. 71, 79, 250, 251, 347, 392, 485, 653.

(4) The following are sacramental hymns: 233, 242, 245, 248, 254, 257.

(5) The following hymns teach the worship of the accursed tree: 130, 134, 135, 141, 148.

(6) The following hymns teach the cultus of the Virgin Mary: 131, 142, 146, 292, 248, 397.

(7) The following objectionable on baptism, 267; font, 365, 653.

(8) Teaches prayers for the dead, 279.

(9) Teaches apostolic succession, 285.

Among objectionable hymns are: Simpson's, 141; 142, 392, 489.

So grave are the consequences that fall in this matter on our Church, ourselves and our children, and so heavy is our personal responsibility to God, that it may be well to go more into detail for the benefit of those who have not the material to refer to in order to determine what is their duty.

The Ritualistic sect considers that the time is ripe for an onward movement. It sought to procure the authorization of the General Synod of our Church to a book containing these obnoxious hymns. Thereby the approval of the whole Church was to be given to, and every congregation obliged to use, hymn books in which are found hymns as repugnant to the members of the Church of England to-day as they were to them at the time of the Reformation. This would draw our Church a long way nearer to the Church of Rome, and widen irremediably the distance between it and the members of the other Protestant Churches. The Ritualistic sect

would thereby establish another reason for its right to its title. One of the principal means of carrying on their work was by the introduction of Romish hymns taken from the Roman or Paris Breviary, and drawing from the writings of the celebrated exponents of the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation.

This mode of getting the congregations of our churches accustomed to Romish phraseology, and worse, to Romish doctrines, has been possibly the most successful of all the efforts put forth by the Ritualists to educate the members of our Church in Popery, and to pervert the Protestant faith. Of all the many hymnals which have issued from the press controlled by the Ritualists none can compete, either for subtlety or success, with the volume known as Hymns, Ancient and Modern, which boasts of a circulation of over eight million copies. There is there found so skilful an admixture of gospel, sentimental, and Romish hymns, as may well betray the unsuspecting and the simple. The wisdom of the serpent, in giving at first a mild dose of poison, to be increased from time to time as the persons become accustomed to it, is too obvious to need remark. A faithful Bishop observed in an address to his Synod against the use of Hymns, Ancient and Modern, that "if all the hymns were unsound they would at once have been detected, and very few would have been deceived. It was, therefore, a skilful masterpiece of our Anglican Romanizers to administer the poison in small doses, not to be perceived immediately, but to effect, nevertheless, eventually their purpose, of undermining the spiritual constitution of our Reformed Church."

The Book of Common Praise follows on these lines,

and in it the Ritualistic sect seeks to inculcate the following doctrines of Rome:

- (a) Transubstantiation and the Real Presence.
- (b) Idolatry, or the worship of material things.
- (c) Salvation by human works.
- (d) Baptismal regeneration—*ex opere operato*.
- (e) Mariolatry.

It is not surprising, where so many of the doctrinal hymns have been drawn from Roman Catholic Breviaries, missals and other Popish sources, some of them being standard hymns at present used in the Romish Church, that the tone of the book is largely of the flavor of the Church of Rome, rather than of the Church of England.

Now let us examine some of the hymns which have thus found their way into the work offered to the Church for general acceptance.

Lord Selborne, better known as a hymnologist, under his earlier title of Sir Roundel Palmer, speaks of the well-known sacramental hymns of Dr. Thomas Aquinas, and calls them "a group of remarkable compositions, written by him for the then new festival of Corpus Christi, of which he induced Pope Urban IV. (1261-65) to decree the observance. In these he says, "The doctrine of transubstantiation is set forth with a wonderful degree of scholastic precision; and they exercised probably a not unimportant influence upon the general reception of that dogma." But you will say, surely the compilers have not to-day gone back to the arsenal of the Church of Rome to select hymns for use at that service, vital differences in respect of which were the main reason for the separation from Rome! Yea, verily they have; and have even taken the hymns of the Romish champion of transubstantiation, Thomas Aquinas, to seek

to accomplish in the 20th century in the Church of England what he did in the 13th century for the Church of Rome. Persons were then slow to accept this new doctrine, the fruit of the priestcraft of the Roman Church, and they looked much to the wiles of this Doctor of Subtlety to introduce this doctrine; and it was then successfully done, and still remains the centre error of this Church. Take one of these hymns, No. 248, noted as the hymn to be used at vespers for the great festival of Corpus Christi, and, therefore, must be taken as conveying her own mind on this distinctive dogma too emphatically to allow of a question as to the import of the words. This hymn inculcates the central error of the great apostasy. In Article XXVIII. our Church protests against the figment of any change in the bread and wine. In defiance of this a hymn is sought to be introduced into this service which absolutely asserts transubstantiation and a worship of the elements in the teeth of the further teaching of our Church that "no adoration is intended or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine . . . or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood." I quote the first verse, as it introduces "The glorious Body," as a starting point for worship made objective in verses iv. and v., and is needed to be the complement of the "Suggestions" referred to!

Now, my tongue, the mystery telling
Of the *glorious Body* sing,
And the Blood, all price excelling,
Which the *Gentiles' Lord and King*,
In a *Virgin's womb* once dwelling,
Shed for this world's ransoming.

I do not at present further refer to lines four and five than to call attention to the fact of the undue exalting of the Virgin Mary which is there found.

*“The Gentiles’ Lord and King,
In a virgin’s womb once dwelling.”*

This is to strengthen the Roman cultus of mariolatry—that the Virgin Mary was mother of God!

But to proceed to verse 3:

“Gives Himself with His own Hand.”

An introduction to the idea of the actual body of the Lord being handed over to the recipient. Then in verses 4 and 5:

*Word-made-flesh true Bread He maketh
By His Word His Flesh to be;*

*Therefore we, before Him bending,
This great Sacrament revere;*

The teaching is again presented of an actual change. He maketh

*“ . . . True Bread,
“By His word His flesh to be”—*

“To be” is the recognized formula of Rome to express a substantial change in the elements.

Then, this substantial change in the elements having been made, and by the act of the creature, there is produced the Creator, the natural sequence of worship follows. It is because of this that the last verse begins:

“Therefore, we, before Him bending.”!

The actual Body and Blood is now called “Him.”

(God)—before whom we are to bend. There further follows, naturally:

"This great Sacrament revere;"!

The Bread and Wine, changed by the word of the priest, become the Body of God and the Sacrament to be revered.

A continuation of this statement is given in No. 245, taken from the same source. The first verse runs as follows:

*"Thee we adore, O hidden Saviour, Thee,
Who in Thy sacrament dost deign to be;*

*Both flesh and spirit at Thy presence fail,
Yet here Thy presence we devoutly hail."*!

Observe how absolutely distinct is the teaching of Dr. Aquinas—adoration or worship is to be given to a Saviour hidden in the Sacrament.!

*"Oh, hidden Saviour,
Who in Thy Sacrament dost deign to be."*

If our blessed Lord was not in the Sacrament, and there was worship accorded, it would be idolatry, as being given simply to Bread and Wine. But because of the *opus operatum* of the priest there is such a change, either by transubstantiation or consubstantiation or a real presence, that the hymn proceeds:

"Yet here Thy presence we devoutly hail."!

In the second verse,

*"O blest memorial of our dying Lord,
Who living Bread to men doth here afford!"*

We have the statement, "*who living Bread to men doth here afford!*" It is to be observed that it is "*here*"—that is, in the sacrament that is then and there given.

Again, in the first line of the last verse, we have:

"O, Christ, Whom now beneath a veil we see."

This involves the teaching that Christ is to be seen veiled in the Bread and Wine.

In verse 3 of 254, the same learned Doctor sought to buttress the idea he is seeking to inculcate in these lines:

*"He gave Himself in either kind,
His precious Flesh, His precious Blood;"*

Another Communion Hymn (No. 233) that is of a dangerous character, by another writer, has these two lines:

*"We here present, we here spread forth to Thee
That only offering perfect in Thine eyes,"*

Again, verse 3, line 2:

"By this prevailing presence we appeal;"

And again, verse 4, line ?

"And by this Food, so awful and so sweet,"

Can verse 4, in Hymn 397:

*Alleluia! King Eternal,
Thee, the Lord of Lords, we own;
Alleluia! Born of Mary,
Earth Thy footstool, Heaven Thy throne;*

Thou within the veil hast entered,
Robed in flesh, our great High Priest;
Thou on earth *both Priest and Victim*
In the Eucharistic Feast.

be defended on any ground in a Church of England Hymn Book? Have we any right by the use of the words

“*King Eternal . . . born of Mary,*”

to teach the doctrine that she was the mother of God?

Again, in the last line of verse 6, of Hymn 251:

“We have an *altar here,*”

the word cast out of the prayer book is reintroduced,

“And feel, when we approach *Thy board,*
We have an *altar here.*”

Again, in Hymn 250, first verse, last two lines:

“And thus, inspired with holy fear,
Before Thine altar kneel.”

Again, from one of the old Latin Hymns, No. 242:

“Draw nigh and *take the Body of the Lord,*
And *drink the holy Blood* for you outpoured.”

Closely connected with the idolatry of the mass which is above displayed in worshipping Bread and Wine, is the adoration inculcated of the cross and of the nails, etc. Take the following verses, 4 and 5, from a regular Catholic jingle, Hymn 130:

*"O, tree of glory, tree most fair,
Ordained those holy limbs to bear,*

*How bright in purple robe it stood,
The purple of a Saviour's blood!"*

*"Upon its arms, a balance true,
He weighed the price for sinners due,
The price which none but He could pay,
And spoiled the spoiler of his prey."*

*"Faithful cross, above all other,
One and only noble tree,
None in foliage, none in blossom,
None in fruit, Thy peer may be;
Sweetest wood, and sweetest iron;
Sweetest weight is hung on Thee."*

*"Bend, O lofty tree, thy branches,
Thy too rigid sinews bend;
And awhile the stubborn hardness,
Which thy birth bestowed, suspend;
And the limbs of heaven's high monarch
Gently on thine arms extend."*

It is needless to say that these are also taken from the old Roman hymnology, being from the Latin of Fortunatus, a writer supposed to be of the seventh century.

The book would be the better of the omission of these words in Hymn 71, part 3:

*"While angels join to swell
The Church's heavenly song,
He comes, with faithful hearts to dwell,
Who round His altar throng."*

"Lord Jesus, as we kneel
Before Thy throne of grace,
May we Thy *hidden presence feel*,
The brightness of Thy face! Amen."

The compilers call attention to the fact of:

"The fuller provision made for *processionals*, and also for *short closing hymns*, sometimes known as '*Vesper Hymns*'"—

They also say: "Some hymns are included, *which have only of late acquired a popularity which promises to be lasting*; e.g., Hymns Nos. 141, 142, 392, 489.

All will, with regret akin to sorrow, look vainly for scores of hymns, tried, tested and loved, and *this feeling will be increased when we read the hymns in favour of which the old favourites have been omitted*.

What is there in Hymn 141 to warrant its insertion but the expression in the last line of the first verse, whereby the Ritualist desires to introduce the reader to mariology?

"Son of Mary, plead for me."

It is scarcely possible to bear the wretched doggerel of No. 142:

"Jesus is dying, in agony sore,
Jesus is suffering more and more."

Fancy such a hymn being allowed to replace:

"My hope is built on nothing less
Than Jesus' Blood and righteousness.
I dare not trust the sweetest frame,
But wholly lean on Jesus' name;
On Christ, the solid Rock, I stand,
All other ground is sinking sand."

But the cause for the love of this new writer-is made more plain when we come to Hymn 392, which is a jingle, without melody, but contains, verse 3:

*"All for Jesus—at Thine altar
Thou wilt give us sweet content;
There, dear Lord, we shall receive Thee,
In the solemn sacrament."*

Nor has the fourth of this series, No. 489, any more claim to poetical beauty nor to scriptural teaching. See verse 3:

*"I adore Thee, I adore Thee,
Born of woman, yet divine!"*

Is this true: Was God, as God, born of woman?
I much prefer the Gospel jingle of the Salvation Army Hymn Book.

It is very clear whither these hymns were intended to lead. The facts show conclusively how far they actually carried those using them.

Read the following verse from the advanced Ritualistic Hymn Book, called "Hymnal Noted":

*"Farewell to types, henceforth
We feed on angels' food;
The guilty slave, Oh wonder,
Eats the Body of his God." !!!*

But I must draw to a conclusion, and have but time to ask you to glance at, out of the many poor in poetry and poorer in doctrine, the following:

No. 653, verse 3:

*"We love the sacred font,
For there the Holy Dove,*

To pour is ever out,
His blessing from above."

No. 285:

"His twelve apostles first He made
His ministers of grace,
And they their hands on others laid,
To fill in turn their place.
So age by age, and year by year,
His grace was handed on."

No. 279: Prayers for the Dead.

No. 365:

"For the font's renewing waters,
For the altar's feast divine,
In thy world and in thy temple
Sacrificing day by day."

It is said that this is a fine hymn book; that many will adopt it. I believe this to be the case. It has been greatly advertised. There will always be a "broad way," and many will walk therein. Let us not do so. Christ came to redeem to Himself a "peculiar people," contented to walk in the "narrow way." Let us be well satisfied to do so. In this way we are safe; out of it we are in peril. Even in the matter of a hymn book, let us not be broader than our Master. When the Ritualists sought to propagate their views by the introduction of their then new book, "Hymns, Ancient and Modern," the Evangelicals did not sit down and permit the Church to be completely flooded with this teaching. Like men they set to work and issued a good book, "The Hymnal Companion." It answered well its pur-

pcse. It is time that another hymn book should be published on the same lines. The spirit and the love of truth is still very much alive among anti-Ritualists yet. But friends in England will, if needed, aid, and we shall be able to present to the congregations of our Church a splendid, up-to-date hymn book, without Roman poison, and which can really and heartily be enjoyed by them. All the money needed will be forthcoming to give us a book that we may with joy look upon as a real Book of Praise. Let us not forget that this is a time of testing. Let us stand fast. Let us determine not to be drawn into any hateful compromise of our principles, which will be continually a bitter thought. Let us resolve not to use the Ritualistic book. Not to be the means of leading our people astray by introducing it. Not subscribe to churches where it is used. To correspond with our friends in England on the subject of the issue of a first-class, up-to-date Evangelical Hymn Book; but whether with or without them, let the work be undertaken. Then we shall have a book in which we can from the heart praise God—one which may truly rank with our Book of Common Prayer, and not one at discord with it. God will help and bless us in such work in the future as He has in the past. Do not let us go back on Him.

Faithfully yours,

S. H. BLAKE.

17th August, 1909.





502 Yonge Street, Toronto

*Copies of this Pamphlet and others of the Series can be
obtained from L. S. Haynes, 502 Yonge Street,
Toronto, Canada.*